

### REMARKS

This amendment responds to the Office Action which was mailed on December 8, 2005. In the claims, Claims 1-12 have been canceled and new Claims 13-19 substituted therefor. It is respectfully submitted that new Claims 13-19 are in condition for allowance. Request a favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the amendment and the remarks set forth below which constitute a full and complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Applicant hereby affirms the provisional election to prosecute Group I Claims 1-10 and 12, covering a system for storage and mixing of a solution. Claims 1-12 have now been canceled and new Claims 13-19 substituted therefore. Of course, new Claims 13-19 are also directed to the system for storage and mixing of a solution.

The drawings were objected to for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. More particularly, the "agitator" of Claim 8 and the "quick-release couplings" of Claim 9 were not shown in the drawings. However, Claims 8 and 9 have now been canceled and these limitations have not been included in any of the new Claims 13-19, therefore, the drawings should now be acceptable.

Claims 1-7, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohr (U.S. Pat. No. 1,404,467) in view of Kleman (U.S. Pat. No. 2,120,865). It has been asserted that Mohr discloses all of the limitations of the claims, but lacks a plurality of one-way valves disposed in the fluid conduits to prevent back flow of the ingredients. Kleman is relied upon to teach the plurality of one-way valves. Claims 1-7, 10 and 12 have been canceled and new Claims 13-19 substituted therefor. It

is respectfully submitted that new Claims 13-19 are patentable over the prior art cited and are in condition for allowance.

Applicant's invention as recited in Claims 13-19 is not taught or suggested by the combined teachings of Mohr and Kleman. Applicant's invention provides an integrated, portable, refillable tank that mixes automatically requiring no effort on the part of the operator to turn valves or make adjustments. For the operator, the invention mimics the simple pumping out of a single tank by virtue of its unique design features, including the appropriately sized separate compartments for storing ingredients, the flow regulators, the mixing manifold, and the sump. The mixing of the ingredients which are stored separately as the system is emptied is completely transparent to the user and is user-friendly requiring no special knowledge or training. The claimed system is designed so that ingredients which are stored separately are mixed together in the appropriate ratios as the tank is emptied, without any effort on the part of the operator other than emptying the tank. In addition, a sump is provided to ensure that a properly mixed solution is always available when the system is first emptied.

It is respectfully submitted that the following elements and/or limitations as recited in Claim 13 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the prior art cited. First, although Mohr does teach a storage compartment divided into a plurality of compartments each to store a different ingredient, it does not teach or suggest that the storage capacity of each compartment be proportionate to an amount of an ingredient in a mixed solution. As recited in Claim 13, applicant claims "a storage tank divided into a plurality of compartments, each compartment adapted to isolate and store an ingredient,

*and wherein the storage capacity of each compartment is proportionate to an amount of an ingredient in the mixed solution.”*

In addition, it has been asserted that Mohr teaches a manifold for mixing of ingredients. However, Mohr merely teaches piping wherein different ingredients are mixed at different times and in different quantities depending on how and when an operator sets various valves. The system described in Mohr requires significant operator activity and control, whereas applicant's invention mimics a simple tank, i.e., the mixing of ingredients which are stored separately to produce the desired solution upon emptying the tank is completely transparent to the user and requires no setting of valves or controls by the user.

Further, it has been asserted that Mohr teaches a sump 1 coupled to an output aperture of the manifold. In actuality, Mohr teaches a bleaching vessel 1 wherein various liquid components are mixed and recycled. Mohr is a very complex system requiring significant operator activity and control. In contrast, for a user, applicant's invention mimics a simple tank from which the desired solution can be emptied. However, applicant's unique design enables the components of the solution to be stored separately until needed, at which the time the components are automatically mixed to produce the desired solution without any activity by the user other than emptying the tank. In addition, the unique sump of applicant's claims provides a ready source of the desired solution immediately upon pumping/emptying of the tank system. For example, Claim 13 recites “a sump coupled to an output aperture of the manifold *for holding a quantity of the mixed solution* and comprising at least one discharge port.” This feature is also clearly not described in the teachings of Mohr.

It should also be recognized that the plurality of control valves in applicant's invention are fixed to produce flow rates which produce the desired the solution. No operator control is required to take advantage of applicant's invention. It automatically produces a desired solution upon each use.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 13 and 19 include limitations which are not made obvious by the prior art cited, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. In addition, Claims 14-18 are dependent from Claim 13 and are further limiting thereto, therefore, these claims should also be in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, Hicks was relied on to teach an agitator, while Laabs was relied on to teach quick-release couplings. These features have now been canceled from the claims, and were in any event only included in dependent claims.

In summary, Claims 1-12 have been canceled and new Claims 13-19 substituted therefor. Claims 13-19 remain in the case and based on the foregoing amendments and remarks should not be considered obvious in view of the prior art cited. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Early reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is earnestly solicited, as is allowance of the claimed subject matter.

Respectfully submitted,

April 6, 2006  
DATE



U. John Biffoni  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 39,908  
Tel. No. (410) 436-1158